REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the application. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,143,139 to Burbeck et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,047,315 to Srivastava.

Applicants' independent claim 1 requires, among other things, providing a database of bindings of request identifiers to replicas where each binding is a record having a request identifier, a replica identifier and a binding expiration time, the database associated with a first router of the plurality of routers. The Examiner cited to col. 4 lines 60-67; col. 3 line 25; col. 5 lines 45-55; col. 9 lines 1-5; and col. 4 lines 1-4 as teaching or suggesting this limitation.

However, neither the cited text nor any other text of Burbeck et al. actually discloses providing a database of bindings of request identifiers to replicas where each binding is a record having a request identifier, a replica identifier and a binding expiration time, the database associated with a first router of the plurality of routers, as required by Applicants' independent claim 1. Indeed, the phrase "database" does not appear **anywhere** in Burbeck et al., and nowhere in the cited text does Burbeck et al. even suggest that a database of bindings of request identifiers to replicas is stored. Further, nothing in the cited text teaches or suggests a binding expiration time. Indeed, the Examiner seems to attempt to use a service level agreement of a storage service provider as evidence of such an expiration time, *see* Office Action page 3, but Applicants respectfully submit that such an agreement has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with a binding of a request identifier to a replica as disclosed throughout Applicants' claims and specification. Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's other support for the teaching or suggestion of this limitation with Burbeck et al., namely col. 3 line 25, has nothing to do with a binding expiration time,

but rather teaches a configurable time interval for sending a request for data if certain conditions are not. Applicants are respectfully at a loss as to how this applies to a binding expiration time. Thus, for at least any of the reasons given above, Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants' independent claim 1, and therefore Applicants' independent claim 1 is allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

Applicants' independent claim 1 also requires maintaining a change log of records entered into the database, each change log entry having a change event generated by the first router and an event number sequential to an event number of a preceding change event in the change log. The Examiner cited to col. 11 lines 15-26 of Burbeck et al. as teaching or suggesting this limitation. However, neither the cited text nor any other text of Burbeck et al. teaches or suggests this limitation.

As discussed above with regards to the providing limitation, Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest a database of bindings of request indentifiers to replicas, and thus Burbeck et al. **cannot** suggest that there are any records entered into such a database, or that a change log of those records is maintained. Entirely separate from this matter, however, the Gossip Monger as cited by the Examiner deals with reputation information. The limitation requires that a change log be maintained of records entered into the database; in other words, the records are, according to the providing limitation, the request identifier (which the Examiner previously equated to the persistent node identifier of Burbeck et al.), the replica identifier, and the binding expiration time. However, the Gossip Monger does not deal with any of these things but rather deals with reputation information. Further, it is unclear to Applicants, particularly from the cited text, where the Gossip Monger includes a maintained change log of anything. Indeed, the cited text indicates that the Gossip Monger revises node reputations, *see* col. 11 line 19, but says nothing about keeping a log of such revisions. Thus, for at least any of the reasons given above, Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants' independent claim 1, and therefore Applicants' independent claim 1 is allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

Applicants' independent claim 1 also requires maintaining a current version vector associated with the database and the change log, the current version vector entry for the first router being a most recent event number from the change log, the current version vector entry for each other router being a most recent event number received at the first router from that other router. The Examiner cited to col. 11 lines 15-26 as disclosing this limitation. However, as discussed above with regards to the other limitations of claim 1, Burbeck et al. does not teach or suggest such a database or a change log, and thus **cannot** teach or suggest maintaining anything associated with such a database or a change log. However, entirely apart from this, Applicants respectfully submit that they fail to understand the Examiner's argument regarding this limitation. Indeed, the Examiner simply repeats the same argument made above with regards to the maintaining a change log limitation. Applicants fail to see how the information contained with the cited eleven lines of Burbeck et al. have anything to do with maintaining a current version vector, the current version vector entry for the first router being a most recent event number from the change log, or the current version vector entry for each other router being a most recent event number received at the first router from that other router. Apart from a change log not being mentioned in the cited text, there are also no event numbers mentioned within the cited text; only reputation information stored as metadata. Further, as previously argued by Applicants, and as admitted by the Examiner, Burbeck et al. does not have a plurality of routers, and so Burbeck et al. **cannot** teach or suggest that a current version vector entry for other routers is a most recent event number received at the first router from that other router. Indeed, though the Examiner relies on Srivastava as support for teaching or suggesting a plurality of routers and replicas, the Examiner does not indicate how or even if Srivastava applies in any way to this particular limitation.

In summary, Applicants again respectfully submit that they fail to see the applicability of Burbeck et al. to the claims of the present application. Burbeck et al. is directed towards an entirely different task than the current invention. Burbeck et al. discloses methods, systems, and the like that classify nodes in tiers to reduce network traffic, including using a reputation level for nodes that describes how a node performs

in terms of responding to requests. Applicants' claimed invention, on the other hand, provides for the binding of a DNS name to a particular IP address such that it is persistent, so that when a session exists between a particular client device and a copy of an application executing on a replica (i.e., server or the like), the session is maintained because any further requests by the client of a particular DNS name are directed to the binded IP address, representing the copy of the application the client had previously dealt with (*see at least* specification pages 3-9).

Therefore, for at least any of the reason(s) given above, Applicants' independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Burbeck et al., and thus, Applicants' independent claim 1 is allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

Applicants' independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 all include limitations similar to those of Applicants' allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable independent claim 1, Applicants' independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 are themselves not taught or suggested by Burbeck et al., and thus, Applicants' independent claims 21, 24, 25, and 26 are allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

Applicants' dependent claims 2-20, 22-23, and 27 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable independent claims 1, 21, and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable independent claims 1, 21, and 26, Applicants' dependent claims 2-20, 22-23, and 27 are themselves not taught or suggested by Burbeck et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 2-20, 22-23, and 27 are allowable over Burbeck et al., either alone or in combination with Srivastava.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully

submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/SPM/_____
Shaun P. Montana, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 54,320
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS03-17(7429)

Dated: March 13, 2008